

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 3, 11, 20, and 23 are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 and 6-23 are currently pending and under consideration.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 AND 6-23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER THOMPSON ET AL. (US 5,809,433) IN VIEW OF RUDISILL ET AL. (US 6,272,324)

The present invention as recited in claim 1, for example, relates to an input device having an antenna "arranged inside each of said detachable upper covers at an uppermost portion of the housing, and said input part is arranged on each of said detachable upper covers."

Thompson et al. ("Thompson") discloses a radio communication device, which includes a keypad cover antenna 107 (see FIG. 7) connected to a transmission line 517. Thompson also provides a transceiver circuitry 515 (FIG. 4), which is connected to an elastomeric connector 516 that connects to a flex conductor, or transmission line, 517. The transmission line 517 extends into a hinge assembly 518.

Rudisill et al. ("Rudisill") discloses an electrical connector, which establishes electrical connection between transceiver electronics disposed in a main body 12 of a telephone and remote electrical components contained in a movable cover 14.

However, Thompson and Rudisill, either alone or combination, do not disclose or suggest an input device having an antenna "arranged inside each of said detachable upper covers at an uppermost portion of the housing, and said input part is arranged on each of said detachable upper covers" (see claim 1).

Similar to claim 1, claim 11 recites, "an antenna...detachable from the case along with each of the detached upper covers, wherein said input part is arranged on the first detachable upper cover."

Claim 20 recites, "wherein the first detachable upper cover includes an antenna to wirelessly transmit data and said input part."

Claim 23 recites, a cover comprising “an input part; and an antenna in a first arrangement arranged within an inner volume of the cover or formed on a surface of the cover, wherein the cover is swappable with another cover having an antenna in a second arrangement.”

Therefore, claims 11, 20, and 23 also distinguish over Thompson and Rudisill.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 6-10, and 14-16 (depending from claim 1), 12, 13, and 17-19 (depending from claim 11), and 21 and 22 (depending from claim 20) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claims 1, 11, and 20.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 AND 6-23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER YING ET AL. (US 6,442,400) IN VIEW OF RUDISILL ET AL. (US 6,272,324)

Ying et al. (“Ying”) discloses a portable electronic communication device with a dual band antenna system. Ying describes a printed antenna 40, which is connected to radio circuitry inside a housing 12 (see column 3, lines 48-53) and comprises antenna portions 42 and 44 that are electrically connected to each other and to the radio circuitry inside the housing 12 through an opening 45 in the flip 14 (see column 4, lines 30-35).

However, Ying and Rudisill, either alone or combination, do not disclose or suggest an input device having an antenna “arranged inside each of said detachable upper covers at an uppermost portion of the housing, and said input part is arranged on each of said detachable upper covers” (see claim 1).

Independent claims 11, 20, and 23 recite similar features as claim 1 and thereby, distinguish over Ying and Rudisill.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 6-10, and 14-16 (depending from claim 1), 12, 13, and 17-19 (depending from claim 11), and 21 and 22 (depending from claim 20) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claims 1, 11, and 20.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 14, 2007

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501